
From: Hamayasu, Toru
To: Hashiro, Wayne; Agcaoili, Jennifer
CC: Kaku, Melvin N
Sent: 5/16/2007 3:04:39 PM
Subject: FW: Honolulu Agenda Items - Installment #3
Attachments: No Build_TransitShareComparison.xls; Response to Slater.doc; Stepwise Transit Trips.xls; Stepwise.xls

Redacted

From: Scheibe, Mark [mailto:Scheibe@pbworld.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2007 1:13 PM
To: Hamayasu, Toru
Subject: FW: Honolulu Agenda Items - Installment #3

From: Davidson, William A.
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2007 2:48 PM
To: Jim Ryan (fta) (james.ryan@dot.gov)
Cc: Scheibe, Mark; Fujioka, Heather; Wellander, Chris A.
Subject: Honolulu Agenda Items - Installment #3

I have attached four files that relate to agenda item 2.b.7 -- Analysis of the 2030 No-Build Forecast. This results of the analysis to date are important from a couple of vantage points. First to insure that the 2030 No-Build forecast is yielding reasonable results and to respond to Mr. Slater's letter of November 16, 2006.

The document file was a word file crafted by Mark that responds to the four issues raised in the November '06 letter. The second and third attachments are referenced in that letter. As indicated in the letter, part of the analysis was a step-wise buildup of forecasts to isolate the impact of the model inputs to the corresponding results. In summary, 6% of the growth was related to improvements in transit service between 2005 and 2030, 4% attributable to increasing congestion on the highway network, and the bulk of the growth (90%) a function of the changes in growth.

The response also points out that between 1995 and 2005, the county population grew by 2.7% , while transit ridership increased by 4.8%. Of interest as well was use of the 2005 model to backcast to 1995. The difference between observed (225,700) and the model estimate (223,400) was only 1%.

We also made a 2030 run which utilized the 2005 transit skims, with the 2030 highway skims and person trip matrices. We then compared (in the fourth attachment), the transit shares between the 2005 (survey) observed and the 2030 model output using the 2005 transit network. The second tab in the spreadsheet displays the difference in shares using a user defined threshold. When using a threshold of 5% (plus or minus), very few cells appear. (Note that in the upper part of the table are displayed positive values greater than the threshold, and in the bottom part negative values). Somewhat misleading in this comparison is the fact that the absolute number of trips may be small, thus yielding larger changes in shares -- but as this analysis indicates the two are so close, that does not really matter.

William A. Davidson
PB
303 Second Street, Suite 700N
San Francisco, CA 94107
(415) 243-4601
(925) 202-3395 (mobile)

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration,

AR00148624

dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.